



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

4
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,623	01/22/2001	Hiroyuki Kaneko	1095.1152/JDH	8796

21171 7590 10/05/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/765,623

Applicant(s)

KANEKO, HIROYUKI

Examiner

Quang N. Nguyen

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detail Action

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 08/16/2004. Claims 1-6 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosawa et al. (US 6,047,288), herein after referred as Kurosawa, in view of Fisher et al. (US 6,212,511), herein after referred as Fisher.**

4. As to claim 1, Kurosawa teaches a system and method of group environment specifying and setting, comprising:

group specifying means for specifying, in the case of a predetermined user having logged in, a group to which the user belongs (Kurosawa, Fig. 20, C12:L30 – C13:L34 and C24: L35-43);

using environment specifying means for specifying a using environment corresponding to the group specified by the group specifying means (C13: L35-54);

using environment setting means for setting an environment which conforms to the using environment specified by the using environment specifying means (C14:L55 – C15:L16); and

creating databases according to groups (as illustrated in Figs. 20-21).

However, Kurosawa does not explicitly teach designating one of the databases, which an application program uses.

In a related art, Fisher teaches an access control database defines access rights through the use of access control objects, wherein the database management system (DBMS) 280 of Fig. 9 stores tables of information and has an access privileges module 284 which configures/establishes access rights to each of the tables, where each table stores a different type event notification, in the DBMS indicating which users have access to the tables that make up the event log 282 (Fisher, C16: L22-32 and C17: L5-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kurosawa and Fisher to create databases according to groups and to designate one of the created databases, which an application program uses since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to define, create a database object and register the database object with the event registry to indicate a list of groups with access rights to a list of event notifications (i.e., requests/operations or accessing program applications) to prevent unauthorized

persons from accessing the management information objects in a network in avoiding confidential information be obtained by unauthorized persons and/or the network be open to acts of sabotage.

5. As to claim 2, Kurosawa-Fisher teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the group comprises one or more users (Kurosawa, Fig. 20).

6. As to claim 3, Kurosawa-Fisher teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the database are divided physically or logically according to groups, and the using environment setting means sets one of the databases corresponding to the groups specified by the group specifying means (*i.e., defining and initializing a corresponding set of DBMS tables 282, i.e., an event log, for storing the requested event notifications, one distinct DBMS table per distinct event notification type*) (Fisher, C17: L12-16).

7. As to claim 4, Kurosawa-Fisher teaches the system of claim 1, wherein the group specifying means comprises a table which associates user information regarding each user with the group to which each user belongs and specifies the appropriate group by referring to the user information (*i.e., the access privileges module 284 may have an access privileges table that stores access rights information indicating which users have access to which tables that make up the event logs 282*), which the user entered when the user logged in (*i.e., contained in each access request 120*), and the table (Fisher, C5: L18-31, C9: L35-62 and C16: L22-32).

8. As to claim 5, Kurosawa-Fisher teaches the system of claim 1, further comprising processing means (*an Access Control Decision Function "ACDF" of the MIS 150 is the procedure or a set of procedures that apply the access control rules to each access request so as to determine whether to grant or deny the request*) for performing a process corresponding to a request from the user, wherein the processing means performs a process in the environment for each group set by the using environment setting means (*the MIS 150 receives all management object access requests 120, and distributes each request, or portions of the request to a set of auxiliary servers 152 in accordance with the portion of the management object tree referenced by the request*) (Fisher, C5: L3-7, C6: L34-43 and C8: L33-49).

9. Claim 6 is a corresponding computer-readable record medium claim of system claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 08/16/2004 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rupal Dharia', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER